DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 707 CE 041 195

AUTHOR Stone, James R., III
TITLE Outcome Standards for Secondary Marketing Education.
PUB DATE Dec 84
NOTE 16p.; Paper presented at the American Vocational Association Convention (New Orleans, LA, December 1984).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Competence; Delphi Technique; *Distributive Education; *Educational Quality; Educational Research; Education Work Relationship; *Marketing; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; *Relevance (Education); Secondary Education; *Standards; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A national panel consisting of marketing education advisory committee members, former marketing education students, and marketing education teacher-coordinators reacted to a list of 34 outcome standards developed through a literature review. The 34 standards focused on program quality, program relevance, individual transition to and growth in the world of work, and program impact on support and usage of secondary marketing education. For the study a two-round Delphi technique was used. Of the 34 outcomes, 24 were identified as very important for secondary marketing education. Within these 24 standards, those focusing on the job, job performance, and attitudes towards the job tended to draw a stronger positive response than did those standards focusing on the individual. Recommendations were that the 24 standards be adopted as those to which secondary marketing education programs be held accountable and that each state develop a posttest for program completers and a longitudinal followup of students and employers. (Author/YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED255707

OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR SECONDARY MARKETING EDUCATION

Dr. James R. Stone III
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Continuing and Vocational Education
112 Teacher Education Building
225 North Mills Street
Madison, WI 53706
(608)263-6142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Stone

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OUTCOME STANDARDS FOR SECONDARY
MARKETING EDUCATION

Abstract

A national panel consisting of marketing education advisory committee members, former marketing education students, and marketing education teacher-coordinators reacted to a list of 34 outcome standards developed through a literature review. The 34 standards focussed on program quality, program relevance, individual transition to and growth in the world of work, and program impact on support and usage of secondary marketing education. Twenty-four of the 34 outcomes were identified as very important for secondary marketing education

It was recommended that the 24 standards be adopted as those to which secondary marketing education programs be held accountable. It was further recommended that each state develop a post test for program completers, and a longitudinal follow-up of students and employers.

To what standards should secondary marketing education (ME) programs[1] be held accountable? This question has been the focus of numerous articles, studies, and informal del tes among marketing education professionals. There is little question that the nature and quality of marketing education programs vary from state to state and within states creating a lack of "product consistency" in the eyes of the marketing community (Buckner, et al.,1984).

Historically, the only measure of accountability and quality was counting the number of graduates, "employed in the field for which trained." As Stone and Reece (1984) observed, there has been increasing dissatisfaction with this standard as a measure of success for vocational education. Others, such as Finch and Crunkilton (1979) have argued that this work relatedness standard tends to keep vocational education tied to the past and tends to ignore a host of factors that might affect such a standard.

The question of accountability and standards in education is a concern to the public, although little attention has been directed specifically towards vocational education. If one examined only the 30 commission reports on education (A Nation At Risk, et al.), one would believe that vocational education, and thus marketing education, either does not exist or should not exist. As Swanson observed ". . . that what was omitted from the report was probably more important than what was included" (1984). In light of such reports, the standards that define the contributions of secondary marketing education to the preparation of young people for the transition from school to work need to be more clearly delineated.

---

[1]Marketing Education (ME) used here refers to marketing and distributive education (MDE) and distributive education (DE).

A standard is a level of excellence or attainment, regarded as a measure of adequacy. Dugger (1982) defined standards in vocational education as descriptive statements established by professionals and used as a model to evaluate the degree to which a program meets qualitative and quantitative characteristics of excellence. While there are many standards or outcomes which might be applied to a vocational program such as marketing education, it is generally thought that success as indicated by performance in the employment situation is the standard by which vocational and marketing education programs should be measured (Berns, Burrows, & Wallace, 1979). Finch and Crunkilton (1979) in discussing vocational education as economic education stated that, "the ultimate success of a vocational curriculum is not measured merely through student educational achievement but through the results of that achievement - results that take the form of performance in the work world" (p. 9). There is also the perspective of vocational education as human resource development (Thompson, 1973). That is, vocational education should attend to the individual's growth and discovery of a satisfying role in an occupation.

If program success is indicated by student performance, or by successful acclimation to the world of work, what then are the measures of success? The 1980 Vail Directions Conference provided a forum for leaders from the field to review the mission of marketing education to answer the question: What are we supposed to be doing? One result of the conference was a revised mission statement outlining the philosophical outcomes of marketing education: training for individuals interested in careers in marketing, improving the techniques of marketing, and developing within the marketing education student an appreciation of our free enterprise system. These intended outcomes can provide a philosophic framework for evaluating the extent to which programs

are successful.

Given the mission of marketing education as a framework for evaluating outcomes, Crawford and Meyer (1967) discussed the need for indices for such outcomes to be consistent with the philosophical positions taken. They note that outcomes may be stated at several levels of specificity. These could range from broad macro-level outcomes to the specific where there are measurable indices. These indices often take the form of items on a scale which sample behavior under various conditions. Lecht (1974) observed that vocational programs include educational and manpower aspects and therefore the criteria by which their success is evaluated must take into account both educational and economic dimensions. In addition, he suggested the inclusion of non-economic criteria which he defined as resulting in an increased level of satisfaction or utility for those participating in the educational process.

A cursory review of the literature using Lecht's (1974) three category frame suggests that economic outcomes would include such items as wages or annual income, rates of labor market participation, job satisfactoriness, job status attainment, placement rates, and cost effectiveness. Educational outcomes would include measurement of skills acquired, attitudes towards continued education, and the amount of related occupational training/education obtained beyond high school. Non-economic or social outcomes would include job satisfaction, career satisfaction, life style, community or professional involvement, program completions, and attendance patterns in school.

While the three category classification of standards by Lecht (1974) is commonly found in the literature, a more useful classification system is outlined by Venn (1978). He suggests there should be outcome standards which would focus on program quality, program relevance, individual transition to and growth in the work world, and program impact on organization, policy,

support, and usage of vocational education. This categorization scheme is more useful in focussing on specific components of the program. With the philosophical framework provided by the Vail mission statement, Venn's (1978) classification of outcomes provides the necessary indices alluded to by Crawford and Meyer (1967).

Statement of the Problem

Establishing outcome standards by which secondary marketing education programs can be evaluated is a necessary first step to assure a consistent level of competence of marketing education graduates and thus improve "product consistency." Prior to this study, the dominant thrust of literature on standards focussed on the formative or process aspects of program development, e.g. program structure, teacher credentialling, and the like (Lucas & Miles, 1976; McDonald & Luft, 1979; Strydesky, 1977; Wubbena, 1982). This singular focus on process standards to the exclusion of product or outcome standards has created a vacuum in program development. While much needed attention has been given to improving how a program is offered, little attention has been given to developing measures that would address the quality of the output, i.e. the student and his/her adjustment to the work place.

The present study sought to establish outcome standards very important for secondary marketing education. Such standards would provide guidance for those responsible for program improvement. In addition, these standards were examined post hoc from the philosophic perspective of vocational education as economic education or as human resource development.

The present study was delimited to secondary marketing education programs. Business people, former students, and marketing education educators were asked to judge the standards identified from the literature in terms of importance to secondary marketing education.

Procedure

This study involved a variation of the Delphi technique. The Delphi technique is a methodology for organizing opinion. Originally a forecasting tool, it has been used increasingly in educational research. Ordinarily, it consists of three rounds of communication with a jury or panel. The first round is used to generate statements for reaction in rounds two and three (Weaver, 1971). For this study, only two rounds were used. In place of round one, a list of 34 statements was provided to the panel. These statements were identified through an extensive literature review and included items reflecting the economic education and the human resource development perspective on vocational education (Dugger, 1982; Finch & Crunkilton, 1979; Lecht, 1974; Stone & Reece, 1984; Thompson, 1973; Venn, 1978).

In the spring of 1984, a 20 member panel was selected representing marketing education advisory committee members, former students, and marketing educators. To develop the panel, five states were selected at random. In each of the five states, the state marketing education supervisor was asked to provide a list of advisory committee members and former students. The Marketing and Distributive Education Association (MDEA) provided a membership roster which included marketing education teachers and administrators.

From the initial pool of 80 students and advisory committee members, and from the MDEA membership roster ten business persons, five former students, and five teachers were randomly selected with replacement. The original group of 20 was asked if they were willing to participate. If they failed to reply within ten days a follow-up letter was sent. If they failed to reply within ten days, of the second request, a randomly selected replacement was contacted. The final panel consisted of five business people and two teachers from the initial selection, and five business people, three teachers, and five

students who were selected as replacements. All 20 members of the panel participated in both rounds of the study. Prior to the first round of the Delphi, the instrument was assessed for content validity by a review team including two vocational-teacher educators and an expert in evaluation. Recommendations of the review team were incorporated in the final instrument.

In this study, respondents were asked to make judgments about the degree of importance of the outcome statements. Two sets of materials were distributed to the panel. In the first mailing, the respondents were asked to determine the degree to which each of the outcome statements were perceived as important using the following scale: 1=Not very important; 2=Somewhat important; 3=Important; 4=Very important; 5=Extremely important. A zero point was also provided on the scale to allow respondents the opportunity to indicate that a statement was not relevant to marketing education. This was done in lieu of the more typical undecided or ambivalent midpoint to insure a continuous scale (None of the statements received a score of zero from any of the participants).

If the standard was judged less than important, the respondent was asked to suggest changes or explain the low rating. In addition, respondents were asked to provide additional standards they felt appropriate for secondary marketing education. Based on the information received after the first round of responses, modifications were made prior to the second distribution. The second round sought to assess the level of agreement on each original or revised standard.

Results

A mean score of 3.5 was determined to be the minimum requirement for a statement to be considered a very important outcome for secondary marketing education. Of the 34 outcomes listed, all were judged as relevant to secondary marketing education and at least somewhat important, but only 24 were considered very important.(See Table 1).

Table 1

Outcomes for High School Marketing Education

Standard	Mean[a]
Graduates of marketing education programs should:	
1. Demonstrate skills appropriate to their chosen marketing occupation.	3.9
2. Demonstrate an understanding of the private enterprise system.	3.9
3. Demonstrate work habits appropriate for their marketing occupation.	4.4
4. Demonstrate good citizenship.	4.3
5. Demonstrate entry level competencies appropriate to their marketing occupation.	3.7
6. Demonstrate employability skills.	4.5
7. Demonstrate knowledge of marketing.	3.8
8. Value their marketing training.	3.7
9. Express satisfaction with their (marketing) occupation.	3.5
10. Demonstrate awareness of the role expectations of his/her occupations.	3.4
11. Exhibit pride in their work.	4.5
12. Exhibit autonomy on the job.	3.4
13. Exhibit goal oriented behavior.	3.6
14. Exhibit motivated behavior.	4.3
15. Have long range career plans.	2.9
16. Recognize their own strengths and weaknesses.	3.9
17 Be current on innovations in marketing.	3.1
18. Demonstrate self-confidence.	3.9
19. Acquire additional training/education appropriate for their career goals.	3.8
20. Express satisfaction with their high school vocational marketing education.	3.6
21. Exhibit a commitment to their marketing careers.	3.2
22. Exhibit a commitment to the work ethic appropriate for their present occupations.	3.7
23. Earn salaries appropriate for the occupation taking into account their experiences and education.	3.6
24. Be employed in a marketing occupation providing job security.	2.9
25. Acquire job status in marketing occupations at a rate appropriate considering their experience and education.	3.3
26. Exhibit positive attitudes towards work and their employers.	4.6
27. Obtain employment which has a clearly defined career ladder.	3.1

The program should demonstrate that:		
28.	Graduates of high school marketing education programs are employable in a marketing occupation congruent with their career interests.	3.8
29.	Seventy percent of marketing education graduates will be employed in a marketing occupation within five years of graduation.	3.3
30.	Participation in marketing education will have positive impact on employment in marketing.	3.5
31.	Graduates of high school marketing education programs desiring employment will be placed in an occupation requiring use of their marketing skills.	3.4
Employers should:		
32.	Express satisfaction with the job performance of marketing graduates. Job performance is considered to include the following:	4.4
	Quality of work	
	Quantity of work	
	Job related technical knowledge	
	Job skills	
	Operation of tools and equipment	
	Basic academic skills	
	Work habits/attitudes	
	Punctuality	
	Supervision required	
	Cooperation with co-workers	
	Willingness to learn and improve	
	Cooperate with management	
	Compliance with rules and policies	
	Attendance	
	Overall satisfactoriness	
	Promotability	
33.	Express preference for hiring marketing education graduates over non-marketing education graduates for marketing occupations.	4.0
34.	Seek out marketing education graduates.	3.9

---

a. Scale: 5 = Extremely Important
4 = Very Important
3 = Important
2 = Somewhat Important
1 = Not Very important
0 = Not relevant to a marketing education program

Discussion

Twenty-four of the outcome standards were determined to be very important to secondary marketing education. Within these 24 standards, those focussing on the job, job performance and attitudes towards the job tended to draw a stronger positive response than did those standards focussing on the individual. Such outcomes as appropriate work habits, employability skills, pride in work, positive attitudes towards employer and work, and overall job performance tended to be judged most important. Standards reflecting personal development tended to be judged less important, e.g. autonomy on the job, long range career goals, acquisition of job status, and employment with a well defined career ladder (see Table 1).

As these standards reflect basic philosophy, it is of interest to note that the panel viewed standards reflecting an "economic education" model of vocational education as more important than those reflecting a "human resource development" model (Table 2). While this is not surprising, this has long been the pervasive model in vocational education and was institutionalized by the 1917 Smith-Hughes Act, there are those who argue that the function of vocational ought to be to develop the human resources of this country. Of the five most important outcomes (statements 3, 6, 14, 26, and 32), only one (statement 14) may be construed to reflect the human resource development model. While only one of the least important outcomes (statements 15, 17, 21, 24, and 27) may be construed to reflect the economic education model (statement 24). This would suggest that the philosophical base of marketing education is derived from an economic model of vocational education.

Table 2

A Comparison of Models of Vocational Education

Standards Reflecting an Economic Model of Vocational Education	Mean[a]
Statements numbers 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 23-24, 26, 28-34.	3.9
Standards reflecting a human resource development model for vocational education:	
Statement numbers 12-16, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27.	3.2

a. See Table 1 for complete list of standards and individual mean ratings.

Recommendations

Based on the results of this study it is recommended that the 24 standards identified as very important be considered those outcomes to which secondary marketing ducation programs be held accountable. Teachers and administrators of secondary marketing education should include these 24 outcome standards along with the more traditional process standards in evaluation and program improvement activities.

To determine if secondary programs are meeting these standards, it is recommended that each state implement a comprehension evaluation system including: a post-test for program completers, an employer follow-up, and a longitudinal follow-up of students.

The post-test for program completers would be given to all students who participate in any of the marketing education programs or related specialty programs. The test would be administered at the conclusion of their program regardless of when they complete. It would cover knowledge of marketing, private enterprise, and require performance assessment for entry level competencies applicable to general marketing or to their area of specialty. It would also include knowledge of trends in marketing. In addition, students should be assessed to determine awareness of their strengths and weaknesses as related to marketing careers and their perception of the value of program participation.

The longitudinal follow-up for program completers would seek to contact 100 percent of the completers one year after graduation. Then, at the third and fifth year following graduation a random sample of program completers would be followed-up on a state wide basis. Respondents would be assessed on their satisfaction with the marketing training they received, overall satisfaction with the program, satisfaction with their job, and attitudes

towards their employer and the work performed. In addition, their continued education or training in marketing should be evaluated. Finally, an assessment should be made of their level of income relative to their experience and education.

Employers identified in the one, three, and five year student follow-up, would be contacted and asked to evaluate the marketing education trained employee on such criteria as overall job performance, behavior and autonomy on the job, self-confidence on the job, and on attitudes towards work and the employer. Further, a random sample of employers in marketing should be surveyed on a periodic basis to ascertain their preference for hiring graduates from marketing education programs. Finally, local programs should maintain records of requests from businesses for full-time employees.

REFERENCES

Berns, R.G., Burrow, J.L., & Wallace, H.R. (1980). Marketing and Distributive Education: Review and Synthesis of the Research. (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

Buckner, L., Eggland, S.A., Ely, V.K., Harris, E.E., Lynch, R.L., & Sampson, H.E. (1984, September). Directions for marketing education curriculum and instructional delivery in a period of change. Paper presented at the National Marketing and Distributive Education Curriculum Conference, Atlanta, GA.

Crawford, L. & Meyer, W.G. (1972). Organization and Administration of Distributive Education. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Dugger, W.E. (1982). Standards for Industrial Arts Programs. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Vocational and Adult Education.
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 907).

Finch, C.R., & Crunkilton, J.R. (1979). Curriculum Development in Vocational and Technical Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Lecht, L.A. (1974). Evaluating Vocational Education - Policies and Plans for the 1970's. New York: Praeger.

Lucas, S.R., & Miles, B.E. (1976). The Development of Standards for Secondary Distributive Education Programs. Washington, D.C.:Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association.
(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 113 367).

McDonald, B.A., & Luft, R.L. (1979). Evaluating the Management of Cooperative Marketing Instruction. Distributive Educators Digest, 5(1), 23-27.

Stone, J.R., & Peece, B.L. (1984). Marketing educations impact on employment in marketing. Marketing and Distributive Educators' Digest. 10(1), 9-13.

Swanson, G. I. (1984). At the crossroads of excellence again. Voc Ed, 59(8), 32-35.

Thompson, J.F. (1973). Foundations of Vocational Education: Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Venn, G. (1978). Interpreting Outcome Measures in Vocational Education: A Final Report. National Institute of Education (DHEW), National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University, Columbus.

Weaver, T.W. (1971). The Delphi Forecasting Method. Phi Delta Kappan, 52(5), 267-271.

Wubbena, D. (1982). Fifty-seven program standards identified as very important - A peer review. Marketing and Distributive Educator's Digest. 7(2), 8-14.